

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 25 were examined in the Final Office Action mailed on 11/13/2008 (hereafter "Outstanding Final Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

5 By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 are sought to be amended and declaration by inventors under 37 CFR § 1.132 is sought be submitted. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112, First Paragraph*

10 The Examiner is thanked for withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 7 and 10 in the Advisory Action dated 07/13/2009.

### *Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132*

15 In the Advisory Action dated 07/13/2009, the Examiner had stated that the Applicant has provided no evidence of long felt need for the claimed method. See Paragraph 4 in the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Action Dated 07/13/2009. In response, Applicants submit a Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132.

20 Points 5-14 of the declaration clearly establishes the need for providing enhanced flexibility, and in particular the need for custom rollback procedures, in user programs. The same points also establish the persistence of the need for a fairly long duration and also how the previous approaches (both the references relied upon by the Examiner and the Applicants Admitted Prior Art) have been deficient in satisfying such a need.

25 Points 15-20 of the declaration clearly establishes the manner in which the invention of various presented independent claims satisfy the long felt need.

30 Thus, even assuming arguendo that the references in isolation teach each of the features of the independent claims and/or the Examiner has established a prima facie case of obviousness, it is respectfully submitted that such a prima facie has been adequately rebutted.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103*

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 16-17, 20-21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, Fig. 1 and specification paragraphs 22-33 ("AAPA"), in view of Gostanian *et al*, U.S. 5,781,910 (hereafter "Gostanian"), and in view of Lordi *et al*, U.S. 5,857,204 (hereafter "Lordi").

5

Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's assertions, at least for the reasons noted above with respect to the Declaration, it is submitted that the combined teachings of the art of record does not render obvious the invention of independent claims 1, 7, 10 and 16. One skilled in the relevant arts, without the benefit of the disclosure, would not have been motivated to  
10 combined the references as claimed in each of the currently amended independent claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Thus, it is believed that all objections and rejections have been overcome and continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the  
15 undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: 31 August 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/  
Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number: 41,416